

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/760,509 01/12/2001		01/12/2001	Gilbert Wolrich	10559/317001/P9678	2157	
20985	7590	03/27/2006		EXAMINER		
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC				LI, AIMEE J		
P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2183	
				2183		
				DATE MAILED: 03/27/200	DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/760,509	WOLRICH ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Aimee J. Li	2183		

Boloto the timing of an Appeal Billo	Examiner	Art Unit							
	Aimee J. Li	2183	:						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address									
THE REPLY FILED 21 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In								
	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MEED 706 07/9.								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
AMENDMENTS	within the time period set forth in 3	7 CFR 41.37(a).							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	ecause						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);									
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or 		ducing or simplifying	the issues for						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).									
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment ((PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):									
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•	•						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	explanation of						
Claim(s) allowed:									
Claim(s) objected to:									
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER									
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			nce because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	·						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues in essence on pages 9-12 "There is no description or suggestion... that this 3-ported register file comprises a plurality of two-ported random access memory devices and includes two effective read ports and one effective write port." This has not been found persuasive. As the Examiner cited in Heuring, to show two effective read ports and one effective write port. for the register file and two-ported random access memory devices. A register is effectively a two-ported random access memory device, since a single register generally has one write port and one read port and any location can be accessed at random by an address designated by the processor. The register set's registers do not need to be accessed sequentially, like in a stack, but can be accessed at any point and out of sequential order. Applicant seems to be arguing that the register file of Heuring cannot be physically put into the device of Parady. However, the point of a combination rejection is not whether one device can be physically planted into another device, but what it suggests to a person of ordinary skill in the art. In this situation, it is Heuring suggesting that the register file has two effective read ports and one effective write port and a random access memory device with two ports. In response to applicant's argument that Heuring's entire register file cannot be bodily incorporated into Parady, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981)...

SUPERVISORY PARECHNOLOGY

EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
SUPERVISORY CENTER 2100